

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is earnestly requested.

No claims are amended in this paper; and claims 1-12, 14-16, 19-20, 22-24, 27-30, 32-34, 37-40, 42-43, and 46-62 previously have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 13, 17-18, 21, 25-26, 31, 35-36, 41, and 44-45 are all the claims pending in this application with claims 13, 21, 31, and 41 being the only independent claims.

Claims 13, 17-18, 21, 25-26, 31, 35, 36, 41, 44-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (US 2002/0051442) in view of Chander et al. (US 5,909,561). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Lee relates to a method of transmitting or receiving a broadcast message in a mobile communication system enabling the transmission of a broadcast message including a video. Claim 13 recites "transmitting first and second information in a general page message over a paging channel for a present paging period in a communication cycle having a plurality of time slots, wherein the first information informs arrival of a broadcasting short message and the second information indicates position of a specified slot in said plurality of time slots and for transmitting a data burst message through the specified slot." The Examiner cites Lee, Fig.1, for teaching a "first and second information ... wherein the first information informs arrival of a broadcasting short message and the second information indicates position of a specified slot." Fig. 1 is related to the related art and shows a general page message having a plurality of slots in which slot 0 indicates a number of messages that are included in the general page message. The slot location for each message is predetermined by $3 \times n$ wherein n is the message number (see, Lee, paragraph 0010).

Lee's does not teach transmitting a first information wherein the first information informs arrival of a broadcasting short message. Instead, Lee's related art information is the number of messages in the general page message.

Lee also does not teach transmitting a second message wherein the second message indicates the position of a specified slot for a data burst message. Lee's related art does not transmit any information regarding the position of a data burst message, but instead Lee's related art infers the location through the number of messages.

The invention of claim 13 is different than Lee's related art because the invention of claim 13 includes a second information containing a slot location for a data burst message. Claim 1's data burst message may occur at any identified location of the plurality of slots in the present paging period, not just the locations of the implied slots described by Lee's related art. For at least this reason, Lee's related art does not teach "transmitting ... second information in a general page message ... wherein ... the second information indicates position of a specified slot in ... and for transmitting a data burst message through the specified slot."

The Examiner cites Chander for teaching that the broadcast message is a broadcast short message, but Chandler does not overcome the deficiencies of Lee. Because, Lee and Chander, either alone or in combination, do not teach all the features of claim 13, applicant believes claim 13 is patentable.

Independent claims 21, 31, and 41 recite similar language and are patentable as well for at least this reason.

As set forth in MPEP 2143, to show a prima facie case for obviousness, all the prior art references, either individually or combined, must teach all the claim limitations. Neither Lee nor Chander teach "transmitting first ... information in a general page message ... wherein the first information informs arrival of a broadcasting short message" and "transmitting ... second information in a general page message ... wherein ... the second information indicates position of a specified slot ... and for transmitting a data burst message through the specified slot," and applicant submits that a prima facie case for obviousness has not been shown and that claims 13, 21, 31, and 41 are patentable over the cited


prior art. Additionally, dependent claims 17-18, 25-26, 35-36, and 44-45 are patentable at least by virtue of dependence from a patentable independent claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain at issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at (213) 623-2221.

Respectfully submitted,
Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: August 26, 2008

By: 

Craig W. Schroyer
Registration No. 51,007
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 035884